

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/553,827	10/20/2005	Mauro Rossotto	09952.0006	4000	
22852 FINNEGAN F	7590 04/19/201 HENDERSON, FARAI	EXAMINER			
LLP			DONABED, NINOS J		
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2444		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/19/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/553,827	ROSSOTTO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
NINOS DONABED	2444		

	NINOS DONABED	2444				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 01 April 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LOWANCE.				
 N The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date						
☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (a) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		20(a) and the annualist	a automolom for			
Extensions of uniteringly be doublened united 37 CFR 1.10(e). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set for thin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	iled within two months	s of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	appeal. Since a			
AMENDMENTS						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, 			cause			
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co		E below);				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying ti	ne issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rais	atad alaima				
	corresponding number or finally reje	cteu ciairris.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	04 0		DT-01 004)			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)						
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
non-allowable claim(s).	□ill not be entered or b) □i	l ha antarad and an a	unlanation of			
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro- 		be entered and an e	xpianation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	vided below or appended.					
Claim(s) allowed: None.						
Claim(s) objected to: None.						
Claim(s) rejected: 27, 30-40, 43-49, 51-52.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
The request for reconsideration has been considered but	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
	F					
 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). Other: See Continuation Sheet. 	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./	/N D /					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444	/N. D./ Examiner Art Unit 2444					

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant argues that the prior art of record does not teach "a delivery packet" which contains both "multimedia service contents" and "corresponding service logic"

Examiner respectfully disagrees and points to column 2 line 43 - column 3 line 15, Yasukawa in this section clearly teaches image data and image controlling data for controlling the image data. The multimedia data is controlled by controlling data which corresponds directly to the service logic.

Applicant further argues that the prior art of record does not explicitly teach "generating the corresponding service logic using software stored in at least one software cartridge installed in a delivery application logic common to a plurality of multimedia services, each software cartridge containing software specific to a given multimedia service."

Examiner respectfully disagrees and points column 3 line 17 to column 4 line 14, Yasukawa in this section clearly teaches that software at the server common to a plurality of multimedia services is used to generate the service logic which determines how the multimedia data is presented on the terminal. Therefore the service logic for display of the data on the terminal by the projector.

Applicant further argues that the prior art of record does not explicitly teach "installing a new software cartridge in the delivery logic, the installed software cartridge associated with a new multimedia service."

Examiner respectfully disagrees and points to column 2 line 40 - column 3 line 45, Yasukawa clearly teaches a new software in the service logic which is associated with a particular multimedia service based on. The software in the delivery logic is used to devlop the logic which is used to display the multimedia service.